DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 042 189 CG 005 691

AUTHOR	Woods, Richard G.; Harkins, Arthur M.
TITLE	Indians and Other Americans in Minnesota Correctional Institutions. The National Study of American Indian Education.
INSTITUTION	Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis. Training Center for Community Programs.
PUB DATE	Mar 70
CONTRACT	OEC-0-8-080147-2805
NOTE	56p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.90
DESCRIPTORS	Adults, *American Indians, Children, *Court Litigation, Family Background, Individual Characteristics, *Mexican Americans, Minority Groups, *Negroes, *Psychiatric Services, Social Problems, Youth

ABSTRACT

This report compares the characteristics of Indian American new court commitments with the characteristics of Negro, Mexican-American, and white new court commitments during the same period of time. A total of three categories of individuals was examined, juveniles, youth, adults. The populations used are not representative of the ethnic groups in question, however, the data may be useful in pointing up characteristics which are socially, if not statistically, significant. Data were collected concerning: (1) ethnic comparisons; (2) place of birth; (3) Minnesota County of Residence; (4) place of residence; (5) previous correctional histories; (6) marital status and living situation; (7) religion; (8) intelligence estimate; (9) educational attainment; (10) occupational skill level; (11) current employment status; and (12) previous psychiatric treatment and presentence psychiatric evaluation. (KJ)

ED042189

TRAINING CENTER for Community Programs

in coordination with the Office of Community Programs,
Center for Urban and Regional Affairs

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

INDIANS AND OTHER AMERICANS

IN MINNESOTA CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS

University of Minnesota

CG 005 691

INDIANS AND OTHER AMERICANS
IN MINNESOTA CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS

by

Richard G. Woods

and

Arthur M. Harkins

Training Center for Community Programs
in coordination with
Office of Community Programs
Center for Urban and Regional Affairs

University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota

March, 1970

THE NATIONAL STUDY OF AMERICAN INDIAN EDUCATION

INDIANS AND OTHER AMERICANS

IN MINNESOTA CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS

USOE March, 1970

OEC-0-8-080147-2805

This is a section of the Final Report of the National Study of American Indian Education, which has been funded by the United States Office of Education.

The work reported here is part of a large University of Minnesota project, which has been financed from several sources.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION..... 1

Ethnic Comparisons

Table 1: Juvenile Female First Offense by Ethnic Group..... 2

Table 2: Juvenile Male First Offense by Ethnic Group..... 3

Table 3: Male Youth First Offense by Ethnic Group..... 4

Table 4: SRM Adult Male First Offense by Ethnic Group..... 5

Table 5: State Prison Adult Male First Offense by Ethnic Group..... 6

Place of Birth

Table 6: Juvenile Female Birthplaces by Ethnic Group..... 8

Table 7: Juvenile Male Birthplaces by Ethnic Group..... 9

Table 8: Male Youth Birthplaces by Ethnic Group.....10

Table 9: SRM Adult Male Birthplaces by Ethnic Group.....10

Table 10: SP Adult Male Birthplaces by Ethnic Group.....12

Minnesota County of Residence

Table 11: Juvenile Female Minnesota Counties of Residence by Ethnic Group.....13

Table 12: Juvenile Male Minnesota Counties of Residence by Ethnic Group.....14

Table 13: Male Youth Minnesota Counties of Residence by Ethnic Group.....16

Table 14: SRM Adult Male Minnesota Counties of Residence by Ethnic Group.....17

Table 15: SP Adult Male Minnesota Counties of Residence by Ethnic Group.....19

Place of Residence:

Table 16: Place of Residence for Inmate Groups by Ethnic Group.....20

Previous Correctional Histories

Table 17: Previous Juvenile Correctional Histories by Ethnic Group..22

Table 18: Previous Youth Correctional Histories by Ethnic Group.....23

Table 19: Previous Adult Correctional Histories by Ethnic Group.....24

Marital Status and Living Situation

Table 20: Juvenile Female Living Situations by Ethnic Group.....26

Table 21: Juvenile Male Living Situations by Ethnic Group.....27

Table 22: Marital Status of Male Youth by Ethnic Group.....28

Table 23: Male Youth Living Situations by Ethnic Group.....28

Table 24: Marital Status of SRM Adult Males by Ethnic Group.....29
Table 25: SRM Adult Male Living Situations by Ethnic Group.....29
Table 26: Marital Status of SP Adult Males by Ethnic Group.....30
Table 27: SP Adult Male Living Situations by Ethnic Group.....31

Religion

Table 28: Juvenile Female Religious Affiliation by Ethnic Group.....32
Table 29: Juvenile Male Religious Affiliation by Ethnic Group.....32
Table 30: Male Youth Religious Affiliation by Ethnic Group.....33
Table 31: SRM Adult Male Religious Affiliation by Ethnic Group.....33
Table 32: SP Adult Male Religious Affiliation by Ethnic Group.....34

Intelligence Estimate

Table 33: Juvenile Female Estimated Intelligence by Ethnic Group....35
Table 34: Juvenile Male Estimated Intelligence by Ethnic Group.....35
Table 35: Male Youth Estimated Intelligence by Ethnic Group.....36
Table 36: SRM Adult Male Estimated Intelligence by Ethnic Group.....36
Table 37: SP Adult Male Estimated Intelligence by Ethnic Group.....37

Educational Attainment

Table 38: Educational Attainment of Juvenile Females by Ethnic Group.....37
Table 39: Educational Attainment of Juvenile Males by Ethnic Group..38
Table 40: Educational Attainment of Male Youth by Ethnic Group.....39
Table 41: Educational Attainment of SRM Adult Males by Ethnic Group.39
Table 42: Educational Attainment of SP Adult Males by Ethnic Groups.40

Occupational Skill Level

Table 43: Occupational Skill Level of Juvenile Females by Ethnic Group.....41
Table 44: Occupational Skill Level of Juvenile Males by Ethnic Group.....41
Table 45: Occupational Skill Level of Male Youth by Ethnic Group....41
Table 46: Occupational Skill Levels of SRM Adult Males by Ethnic Group.....42
Table 47: Occupational Skill Levels of SP Adult Males by Ethnic Group.....42

Current Employment Status

Table 48: Employment Status of Juvenile Females by Ethnic Group....43
Table 49: Employment Status of Juvenile Males by Ethnic Group.....43
Table 50: Employment Status of Male Youth by Ethnic Group.....43
Table 51: Employment Status of SRM Adult Males by Ethnic Group.....44

Table 52: Employment Status of SP Adult Males by Ethnic Group.....44

Previous Psychiatric Treatment and Pre-Sentence Psychiatric Evaluation

Table 53: Previous Psychiatric Treatment of Inmates by Inmate Classification and Ethnic Group.....45

Table 54: Pre-Sentence Psychiatric Evaluation of Inmates by Inmate Classification and Ethnic Group.....46

Table 55: Physical Problems of Inmates by Inmate Classification and Ethnic Group..-.....47

Table 56: Drug and Alcohol Problems of Inmates by Inmate Classification and Ethnic Group.....48

FOOTNOTES.....49

Introduction

An earlier report[1] has described in considerable detail the characteristics of Indian American inmates who were admitted to Minnesota Department of Corrections institutions during the year July 1, 1967 to June 30, 1968. These new court commitments were persons admitted directly from court commitment as well as individuals who were recommitted by the courts. They did not include individuals transferred from other facilities or parolees returned for violation of parole rules. In a broad sense, new court commitments represent the input of persons to the state's correctional institutions and are not descriptive of the total institutional population, which must be determined as of a given date.

This report will compare the characteristics of Indian American new court commitments with the characteristics of Negro, Mexican American and white new court commitments during the same period of time. As was the case in the earlier report, three categories of individuals will be examined: juveniles, youth and adults. The correctional institutions selected also are the same as in the earlier study.[2]

Throughout this report, it must be remembered that the populations which emerged from this one year of experience are not offered as being typical or representative of the ethnic groups in question - nor of correctional institutions populations, for that matter. The data may be useful, however, in pointing up characteristics which are socially, if not statistically, significant.

Ethnic Comparisons

How did Indian American new court commitments compare with the commitments of persons from other ethnic groups during the period studied?

To begin with, we may consider "first offenses". The "first offenses" for juvenile females who were Indian Americans, Negroes, Mexican-Americans, and whites are specified in Table 1.

TABLE 1

Juvenile Female First Offenses by Ethnic Group
(Figures are percentages)

Offenses	Indian Americans (N = 19)	Negroes (N = 13)	Mexican Americans (N = 3)	Whites (N = 158)
Assault	5.3	15.4	0.0	1.3
Burglary	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3
Curfew and loitering	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Drug laws	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Forgery	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.9
Incorrigibility	15.7	23.1	0.0	27.2
Liquor laws	10.5	0.0	0.0	3.8
Run away	15 7	7.7	33.3	20.9
Sex offenses except rape	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Shoplifting	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.6
Theft	5.3	0.0	0.0	2.5
Truancy	15.7	15.4	0.0	8.9
Unauthorized use of motor vehicle	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.6
Vandalism	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Other	21.1	38.5	66.7	28.5

The percentages in this table must be read with caution, since the number of cases in some instances is quite small. In general, though, first offenses for Indian American females tend to occur in those offense categories (incorrigibility, run aways; truancy, and "other") with the largest proportions of the more numerous whites. By contrast with the other ethnic groups, violation of liquor laws appears to be significant for this Indian American juvenile females. Serious difficulty with drinking among some Indian young people has been a matter of concern to Minnesota Indian adults in the urban setting,[1] and this is a further indication that the problem can reach chronic proportions.

"First offenses" for juvenile males, shown in Table 2, differed in some respects from those just reported for juvenile females.

TABLE 2

Juvenile Male First Offenses by Ethnic Group
(Figures are percentages)

Offense	Indian Americans (N = 43)	Negroes (N = 37)	Mexican Americans (N = 8)	Whites (N = 537)
No data	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Arson	0.0	2.7	0.0	0.0
Assault	9.3	10.8	12.5	3.2
Burglary	20.9	10.8	0.0	16.2
Curfew and loitering	0.0	5.4	0.0	1.7
Disorderly conduct	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.7
Drug laws	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Forgery	2.3	2.7	0.0	2.1
Incorrigibility	7.0	5.4	0.0	6.3
Liquor laws	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.3
Purse snatiching	0.0	5.4	0.0	0.0
Robbery	2.3	2.7	0.0	0.9
Run away	4.7	16.2	25.0	14.2
Shoplifting	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5
Theft	9.3	8.1	0.0	9.7
Traffic/exc. parking	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Truancy	2.3	5.4	0.0	5.6
Unauthorized use of motor vehicle	9.3	13.5	0.0	8.2
Vandalism	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9
Other	30.2	10.8	62.5	22.2

Although the numbers of cases are relatively small for the three non-white groups, the proportions of these minorities committed for assault are much higher than for the white group. Roughly similar proportions of minorities and whites were committed for burglary, forgery, incorrigibility, theft, and unauthorized use of motor vehicle. A relatively high proportion of Indian juvenile males were committed for burglary, but relatively small proportions of that group were committed as runaways and as truants.

The pattern of first offenses for male youth is shown in Table 3, which allows comparisons between the four ethnic groups.

TABLE 3

Male Youth First Offenses by Ethnic Group
(Figures are percentages)

Offense	Indian Americans (N = 17)	Negroes (N = 21)	Mexican Americans (N = 3)	Whites (N = 156)
No data	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.5
Criminal negligence resulting in death	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3
Manslaughter in the second degree	0.0	4.8	0.0	0.0
Murder in the second degree	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Murder in the third degree	0.0	14.3	0.0	1.3
Aggravated assault	5.9	9.5	33.3	0.6
Aggravated robbery	5.9	23.8	0.0	6.4
Simple robbery	0.0	4.8	33.3	3.9
Receiving stolen property over $100	0.0	14.3	0.0	1.3
Theft of over $100	5.9	4.8	0.0	7.7
Unauthorized use of motor vehicle	5.9	0.0	0.0	18.0
Aggravated forgery	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2
Forgery	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3
Fraudulent statements	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Aggravated criminal damage to property	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3
Burglary	76.5	19.0	0.0	32.1
Simple arson	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.9
Non-support/wife or child	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.9
Indecent assault	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2
Rape	0.0	4.8	0.0	0.0
Illegal possession or use of intoxicating liquors (Felony)	0.0	0.0	33.3	3.9
Illegal possession or use of intoxicating liquors (Gross Misdemeanor)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Illegal sale of narcotic drugs	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.9
Illegal possession or use of narcotic drugs	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3
Sex offenses except rape	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3

Since there were only three Mexican-American male youth new court admissions, the proportions shown for new court commitments are misleading. In general, there were no offenses which accounted for similar proportions of new court

commitments for all four groups. When compared to the other three groups, the Indian American male youths showed a pattern of first offenses which was heavily dominated by burglary: although there were only seventeen Indian Americans, three-fourths of them had committed burglary as a first offense. There were no cases of homicide among the Indian Americans, although there were cases of crimes against the person and theft. The comparatively high rate of burglary as a first offense among the male Indian juveniles and youths deserves further study; it is particularly puzzling in view of the often-cited non-materialistic Indian value orientation.

Table 4 compares the first offenses of the four ethnic groups of male adults committed to the State Reformatory.

TABLE 4

SRM Adult Male First Offenses by Ethnic Group
(Figures are percentages)

Offense	Indian Americans (N = 11)	Negroes (N = 16)	Mexican Americans (N = 5)	Whites (N = 119)
No data	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
Criminal negligence resulting in death	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
Manslaughter in the first degree	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
Murder in the first degree	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.1
Aggravated assault	18.2	0.0	0.0	12.6
Aggravated robbery	9.1	25.1	40.0	3.4
Simple robbery	18.2	18.7	0.0	10.9
Theft of over $100	27.3	6.2	0.0	11.8
Unauthorized use of motor vehicle	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.9
Aggravated forgery	9.1	12.5	20.0	24.4
Burglary	18.2	18.7	40.0	0.8
Defrauding insurer	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
Simple arson	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Non-support/wife or child	0.0	6.2	0.0	1.7
Carnal knowledge, child 10 - 14	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
Carnal knowledge, child 14 - 18	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2
Indecent assault	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7
Rape	0.0	12.5	0.0	

TABLE 4 -- SRM Adult Male First Offenses by Ethnic Group (Cont.)

Offense	Indian Americans	Negroes	Mexican Americans	Whites
Illegal possession or use of intoxicating liquors	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.4
Illegal sale of narcotic drugs	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
Illegal possession or use of narcotic drugs	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7
Escape from custody on felony conviction	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7

Because of the small numbers of non-whites, comparable proportions of first offenses do not appear, although all four groups revealed significant proportions of first offenses in the categories of aggravated robbery, aggravated forgery and burglary.

First offenses for adult males committed to the State Prison are recorded in Table 5.

TABLE 5

State Prison Adult Male First Offenses by Ethnic Group
(Figures are percentages)

Offense	Indian Americans (N = 4)	Negroes (N = 27)	Mexican Americans (N = 1)	Whites (N = 134)
Manslaughter in the first degree	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.5
Manslaughter / second degree	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5
Murder in the first degree	0.0	3.7	0.0	2.2
Murder in the second degree		3.7	0.0	2.2
Murder in the third degree	0.0	3.7	0.0	0.0
Aggravated assault	0.0		0.0	
Aggravated robbery	25.0	11.1	0.0	9.7
Simple robbery	0.0	7.4	0.0	3.7
Receiving stolen property over $100	25.0	7.4	0.0	1.5
Theft of over $100	0.0	3.7	0.0	11.9
Unauthorized use of motor vehicle	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0
Aggravated forgery	25.0	11.1	100.0	12.7
Forgery	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Aggravated arson	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7

TABLE 5 -- State Prison Adult Male First Offenses by Ethnic Group (Cont.)

Offense	Indian Americans	Negroes	Mexican Americans	Whites
Burglary	25.0	14.8	0.0	29.8
Possession of burglary tools	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Simple arson	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2
Incest	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5
Carnal knowledge, child 14 - 18	0.0	3.7	0.0	0.7
Indecent assault	0.0	3.7	0.0	3.7
Illegal possession or use of intoxicating liquors	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5
Illegal possession or use of narcotic drugs	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.7
Escape from custody on felony conviction	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7

The small number of cases for Indians and Mexicans makes comparison difficult, but all four groups had members whose first offenses were aggravated forgery and burglary was a fairly common first offense in all groups except in the Mexican-American group.

For all categories of new court commitments, Indian American first offenses, when compared iwth the other groups, are unique in the absence of homicide. On the other hand, assault and robbery -- crimes against the person -- are not uncommon for this Indian population and neither are theft and related crimes and burglary. In fact, a somewhat surprising aspect of this pattern is the prominence of offenses having to do with property. Besides the absence of homicide, there were no crimes against the family, no sex offenses, and -- for the youth and adults -- no drug and liquor law violations.

Place of Birth

It may be useful to compare the places of birth for the new court commitments within each ethnic group. Among juvenile females, the birthplaces are those reported in Table 6.

TABLE 6

Juvenile Female Birthplaces by Ethnic Group
(Figures are percentages)

Place of Birth	Indian Americans (N = 19)	Negroes (N = 13)	Mexican Americans (N = 3)	Whites (N = 158)
No data	10.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
Arkansas	0.0	7.7	0.0	0.0
California	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.4
Illinois	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.5
Iowa	5.3	0.0	0.0	1.2
Kansas	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Kentucky	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Michigan	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Minnesota	78.9	76.9	100.0	78.4
Mississippi	0.0	7.7	0.0	0.0
Missouri	0.0	7.7	0.0	0.6
Nebraska	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
New Mexico	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
North Dakota	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3
Oregon	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Pennsylvania	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
South Dakota	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.9
Tennessee	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3
Washington	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Wisconsin	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3
England or Wales	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Scotland	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3
Japan	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6

As might be expected, a majority of all groups were born in Minnesota. The greatest variety of non-Minnesota birthplaces was shown by the more numerous whites, while the Indian Americans not born in Minnesota came from surrounding states, and the Negroes came from southern states.

Table 7 shows the birthplaces for juvenile males.

TABLE 7

Juvenile Male Birthplaces by Ethnic Group
(Figures are percentages)

Place of Birth	Indian Americans (N = 43)	Negroes (N = 37)	Mexican Americans (N = 5)	Whites (N = 537)
No data	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.4
Alabama	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Arkansas	0.0	2.7	0.0	0.4
California	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3
Colorado	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1
District of Columbia	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2

TABLE 7 - Juvenile Male Birthplaces by Ethnic Group (Cont.)

Place of Birth	Indian Americans	Negroes	Mexican Americans	Whites
Illinois	0.0	8.1	0.0	0.9
Indiana	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Iowa	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1
Kansas	0.0	8.1	0.0	0.0
Louisiana	0.0	2.7	0.0	0.2
Massachusetts	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5
Michigan	0.0	2.7	0.0	0.4
Minnesota	90.7	51.4	62.5	83.6
Missouri	0.0	10.8	0.0	0.4
Montana	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4
Nebraska	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
New York	0.0	2.7	0.0	0.4
North Carolina	0.0	2.7	0.0	0.0
North Dakota	2.3	0.0	0.0	2.0
Oklahoma	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Oregon	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
South Dakota	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.9
Tennessee	0.0	2.7	0.0	0.2
Texas	0.0	2.7	37.5	0.9
Virginia	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Washington	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4
Wisconsin	0.0	2.7	0.0	1.6
Wyoming	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4
England or Wales	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Germany	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.2
Canada	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4
Japan	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
China	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2

A majority of the members of each ethnic group was born in Minnesota. A higher proportion of Indian juvenile males were born in Minnesota than any other group, although the proportion for whites was not much lower. A greater variety of birthplaces was shown by whites, but Negroes were the least likely to have been born in Minnesota and, if they were not, they tended to have originated either in the south or in the industrial states of the north. Those Indian Americans not born in Minnesota tended to cite a birthplace in a surrounding state.

The birthplaces for male youth appear in Table 8.

TABLE 8

Male Youth Birthplaces by Ethnic Group
(Figures are percentages)

Place of Birth	Indian Americans (N = 17)	Negroes (N = 21)	Mexican Americans (N = 3)	Whites (N = 156)
Arkansas	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0
California	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3
Illinois	5.9	0.0	0.0	1.3
Indiana	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Iowa	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Kansas	0.0	14.3	0.0	1.3
Minnesota	82.3	47.6	100.0	78.2
Mississippi	0.0	4.8	0.0	0.0
Missouri	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Nebraska	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
New York	0.0	4.8	0.0	0.7
North Dakota	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2
Ohio	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3
Pennsylvania	0.0	4.8	0.0	0.6
South Carolina	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
South Dakota	5.9	0.0	0.0	1.3
Tennessee	0.0	4.8	0.0	0.0
Texas	0.0	4.8	0.0	0.0
Utah	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Washington	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Wisconsin	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.1
Hawaii	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Norway	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Canada	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6

The pattern of birthplaces for male youth is about what one would expect. Minnesota was the most frequent birthplace for all groups, although there was considerable variety among whites, and Negroes were most likely to have been born elsewhere, notably in southern and industrial northern states. Those Indian youth not originating in Minnesota tended to have been born in nearby states.

In Table 9 the places of birth for adult males committed to the State Reformatory for Men are listed.

TABLE 9

SRM Adult Male Birthplaces by Ethnic Group
(Figures are percentages)

Place of Birth	Indian Americans (N = 11)	Negroes (N = 16)	Mexican Americans (N = 5)	Whites (N = 119)
No data	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
Arizona	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.8
Arkansas	18.2	12.6	0.0	1.7
California	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8

TABLE 9 -- SRM Adult Male Birthplaces by Ethnic Group (Cont.)

Place of Birth	Indian Americans	Negroes	Mexican Americans	Whites
Colorado	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7
District of Columbia	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
Florida	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.5
Idaho	18.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
Indiana	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7
Iowa	0.0	6.2	20.0	5.1
Louisiana	0.0	6.2	0.0	0.0
Michigan	0.0	6.2	0.0	0.8
Minnesota	9.1	0.0	20.0	6.7
Mississippi	0.0	18.7	0.0	0.8
Missouri	0.0	25.1	0.0	1.7
Nebraska	0.0	6.2	0.0	0.0
Nevada	9.1	12.6	20.0	25.2
New Jersey	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
New York	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
North Carolina	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7
North Dakota	9.1	0.0	0.0	2.5
Ohio	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7
Oklahoma	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
Pennsylvania	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
South Dakota	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7
Tennessee	0.0	6.2	0.0	0.0
Texas	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0
Washington	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
West Virginia	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
Wisconsin	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2
Wyoming	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
Hawaii	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
Puerto Rico	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9
Other USA Possessions	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9
England or Wales	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9
Ireland	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.4
Norway	18.2	0.0	0.0	0.9
Germany	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7
Poland	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.9
Czechoslovakia	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9
Russia	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9
Greece	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9
Canada	18.2	0.0	0.0	3.4
Mexico	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9
Central America	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
South America	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9
Philippines	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7
All other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8

The pattern of birthplaces, especially for whites, was unusual. Fully one-fourth of the whites were born in foreign countries, excluding Canada, and only 6.7% were Minnesota-born. Another one-fourth originated

in Nevada. The pattern of birthplaces for Indian American adult males also was unusual; only about 10% were born in Minnesota, and the remainder came from a variety of states and even foreign countires, revealing a much wider spectrum of origin than the immediate surrounding area. The number of cases for Indians, however, was small, as it was for the other two minority groups.

Table 10 shows the birthplaces for adult males committed to the State Prison.

TABLE 10

SP Adult Male Birthplaces by Ethnic Group
(Figures are percentages)

Place of Birth	Indian Americans (N = 4)	Negroes (N = 27)	Mexican Americans (N = 1)	Whites (N = 134)
Alabama	0.0	3.7	0.0	0.0
Arkansas	0.0	3.7	0.0	0.7
California	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.3
Florida	0.0	3.7	0.0	0.0
Illinois	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3
Indiana	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Iowa	0.0	7.4	0.0	2.3
Kansas	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Kentucky	0.0	3.7	0.0	0.7
Louisiana	0.0	3.7	0.0	0.7
Massachusetts	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Michigan	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Minnesota	100.0	11.1	100.0	62.3
Mississippi	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0
Missouri	0.0	7.4	0.0	0.0
New Hampshire	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
New Jersey	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
North Dakota	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.0
Ohio	0.0	3.7	0.0	1.5
Oklahoma	0.0	3.7	0.0	0.7
Oregon	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Pennsylvania	0.0	3.7	0.0	0.7
South Carolina	0.0	3.7	0.0	0.0
South Dakota	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.3
Tennessee	0.0	14.8	0.0	0.7
Texas	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.7
Washington	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Wisconsin	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.6
Puerto Rico	0.0	3.7	0.0	0.0
Germany	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Poland	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Hungary	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Canada	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7

All four Indian Americans were born in Minnesota. The largest variety of birthplaces occurred with the more numerous whites, and Negroes had the lowest proportion born in Minnesota and tended to reveal southern states as points of origin.

Except for the atypical pattern shown for adult males committed to the State Reformatory, Minnesota was the usual birthplace, and that was particularly true for Indian inmates. In all probability,then, the significant life experiences for these Indian inmates occur within Minnesota, and that likelihood suggests that steps to prevent serious conflict with the law must be taken within the state.

Minnesota County of Residence

How did the various ethnic groups compare in terms of their counties of residency within Minnesota? For juvenile females, the Minnesota counties of residence are reported in Table 11.

TABLE 11

Juvenile Female Minnesota Counties of Residence by Ethnic Group
(Figures are percentages)

County	Indian Americans (N = 19)	Negroes (N = 13)	Mexican Americans (N = 3)	Whites (N = 158)
Anoka	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.6
Becker	15.8	0.0	0.0	3.8
Bigstone	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3
Carlton	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Clearwater	10.5	0.0	0.0	0.6
Cook	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Crow Wing	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3
Dakota	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.6
Dodge	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.9
Douglas	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Faribault	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Goodhue	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Hennepin	52.6	84.6	33.3	46.8
Itasca	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.6
Kandiyohi	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Koochiching	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Le Sueur	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Lyon	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3

TABLE 11 - Juvenile Female Minnesota Counties of Residence by Ethnic Group (cont.)

County	Indian Americans	Negroes	Mexican Americans	Whites
McLeod	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Martin	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Mille Lacs	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Morrison	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Mower	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3
Olmstead	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.9
Polk	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.9
Ramsey	5.3	15.4	66.7	5.9
Redwood	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
St. Louis	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.2
Scott	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.9
Sherburne	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Stearnes	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Stevens	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Todd	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Waseca	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3
Washington	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Winona	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3

The counties of residence for the three minority groups, when compared with the whites, tended to be those encompassing the state's center of population. As might be expected, Indian juvenile females not residing in Hennepin or Ramsey counties (the counties which encompass the cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul, respectively) tended to come from counties having or bordering Indian reservations.

Juvenile males revealed the pattern of county residence shown in Table 12.

TABLE 12

Juvenile Male Minnesota Counties of Residence by Ethnic Group
(Figures are percentages)

County	Indian Americans (N = 43)	Negroes (N = 37)	Mexican Americans (N = 8)	Whites (N = 537)
No data	0.0	2.7	0.0	0.4
Aitkin	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Anoka	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.3
Becker	13.9	0.0	0.0	0.4
Beltrami	6.9	0.0	0.0	0.4
Benton	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Bigstone	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Blue Earth	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9
Brown	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6

TABLE 12 -- Juvenile Male Minnesota Counties of Residence by Ethnic Group (cont.)

County	Indian Americans	Negroes	Mexican Americans	Whites
Carlton	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Carver	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Cass	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.6
Chisago	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Clay	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Clearwater	9.3	0.0	0.0	0.4
Cook	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Crow Wing	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9
Dakota	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.8
Douglas	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Faribault	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.6
Freeborn	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.6
Goodhue	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9
Hennepin	34.9	73.0	25.0	34.6
Isanti	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1
Itasca	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1
Jackson	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Kanabec	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Kandiyohi	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Kittson	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Koochiching	2.3	0.0	0.0	2.4
Lake	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4
Lake of the Woods	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Lyon	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Mahnomen	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
Marshall	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.2
Martin	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Meeker	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Mille Lacs	6.9	0.0	0.0	0.6
Morrison	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Mower	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Murray	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Nicollet	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4
Nobles	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1
Olmsted	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.8
Otter Tail	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4
Pennington	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9
Pine	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1
Polk	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9
Pope	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4
Ramsey	2.3	21.6	50.0	9.8
Red Lake	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Redwood	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Renville	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1
Rice	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Rock	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Roseau	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
St. Louis	11.6	2.7	0.0	6.3
Scott	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.8
Sherburne	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9
Sibley	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4

TABLE 12 -- Juvenile Male Minnesota Counties of Residence by Ethnic Group (cont.)

County	Indian Americans	Negroes	Mexican Americans	Whites
Stearnes	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0
Steele	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Stearnes	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Todd	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4
Wabasha	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Wadena	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Waseca	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9
Washington	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.8
Wilkin	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Winona	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9
Wright	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6

Due to the large number of whites, huge variety in the counties of residence for that group is revealed in Table 12. Less than half the whites were from Hennepin and Ramsey counties, while the great majority of Negroes and Mexican-Americans were from these two counties (although the numbers for these two groups were slight). Indian American juvenile males were more likely to be residents of counties having Indian reservations than the counties encompassing Minneapolis and St. Paul.

The Minnesota counties of residence for male youth appear in Table 13.

TABLE 13

Male Youth Minnesota Counties of Residence by Ethnic Group
(Figures are percentages)

County	Indian Americans (N = 17)	Negroes (N = 21)	Mexican Americans (N = 5)	Whites (N = 156)
No data	5.9	4.8	0.0	3.9
Aitkin	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
Anoka	0.0	4.8	0.0	7.1
Becker	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3
Beltrami	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.6
Carlton	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
Cass	11.8	0.0	0.0	1.3
Chisago	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6
Clay	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Cottonwood	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3
Crow Wing	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2
Douglas	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Faribault	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.9
Freeborn	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6

TABLE 13 -- Male Youth Minnesota Counties of Residence by Ethnic Group (cont.)

County	Indian Americans	Negroes	Mexican Americans	Whites
Goodhue	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.9
Hennepin	52.9	71.4	0.0	25.6
Kandiyohi	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.9
Koochiching	5.9	0.0	0.0	1.3
Martin	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Mower	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6
Nobles	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Olmsted	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2
Pine	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3
Polk	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Ramsey	0.0	19.0	100.0	16.0
Redwood	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Renville	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Rice	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
St. Louis	5.9	0.0	0.0	9.0
Scott	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Stearns	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6
Washington	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6
Wilkin	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Winona	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Wright	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3

The majority of Indian American and Negro male youths were residents of Hennepin County, while all three Mexican Americans came from Ramsey County, patterns which are suggestive of the actual population distributions. Almost 60% of the whiltes, by contrast, were residents of counties other than Hennepin and Ramsey. Indian male youths who were not residents of Hennepin County were from counties in reservation areas.

Table 14 shows the counties of residence for adult males committed to the State Reformatory.

TABLE 14

SRM Adult Male Minnesota Counties of Residence by Ethnic Group
(Figures are percentages)

County	Indian Americans (N = 11)	Negroes (N = 16)	Mexican Americans (N = 5)	Whites (N = 119)
No data	0.0	0.0	20.0	3.4
Anoka	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7
Becker	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.8
Beltrami	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8

TABLE 14 -- SRM Adult Male Minnesota Counties of Residence by Ethnic Group (cont.)

County	Indian Americans	Negroes	Mexican Americans	Whites
Benton	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
Blue Earth	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9
Brown	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
Carlton	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7
Crow Wing	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
Faribault	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7
Fillmore	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
Goodhue	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9
Grant	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
Hennepin	63.6	81.2	60.0	45.4
Jackson	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7
Kandiyohio	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
Koochiching	9.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Le Sueur	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
Martin	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9
Morrison	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7
Mower	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7
Nicollet	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
Nobles	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
Olmsted	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
Pennington	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9
Pine	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
Pipestone	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7
Polk	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7
Ramsey	0.0	12.5	20.0	15.1
Red Lake	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
St. Louis	0.0	6.2	0.0	4.2
Stevens	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
Todd	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
Traverse	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Wadena	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9
Winona	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7

Once again, the metropolitan area counties were the home counties for most of the inmates studied, with the Indians inmates with counties of residence other than Hennepin and Ramsey originating in reservation-area counties.

The final group for whom the Minnesota county of residence will be shown is the group of adult males committed to the State Prison. Table 15 specifies these counties for each ethnic group.

TABLE 15

SP Adult Male Minnesota Counties of Residence by Ethnic Group
(Figures are percentages)

County	Indian Americans (N = 5)	Negroes (N = 27)	Mexican Americans (N = 5)	Whites (N = 134)
No data	25.0	25.9	0.0	19.5
Beltrami	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Blue Earth	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Cass	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Clay	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Clearwater	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
Crow Wing	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0
Dakota	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Douglas	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Hennepin	25.0	59.3	0.0	35.3
Kandiyohi	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5
Lake	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Lake of the Woods	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
Le Seuer	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Meeker	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Mower	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Olmsted	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
Otter Tail	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Polk	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Ramsey	0.0	14.8	100.0	18.7
Redwood	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Renville	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
St. Louis	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.5
Sherburne	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Sibley	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Stearns	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Washington	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5
Wilkin	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
Winona	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Wright	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7

Patterns quite similar to those seen before appear here, with the more numerous whites revealing a greater variety of counties of residence, and a majority of each group coming from a metropolitan-area county, except for the Indian inmates, who tended to come from counties having reservations.

The foregoing tables show rather consistent patterns of county residency which mirror actual population distributions. Virtually all the Negroes and Mexican Americans came from Hennepin and Ramsey Counties, the whites were the most likely to come from non-metropolitan counties, and the Indians came either from counties encompassing the Twin Cities or from reser-

vation counties. It is apparent that, for Indian Americans, as contrasted with whites, for example, it would be possible to concentrate efforts to deal with actual or potential offenders within a selected few Minnesota counties.

Place of Residence

Another way to look at the residential origins of these different groups of inmates is to classify residence according to whether it is metro politan, urban, rural non-farm, rural farm, or transient. Table 16 presents such a classification for each of the inmate groups according to the appropriate ethnic subdivisions.

TABLE 16

Place of Residence for Inmate Groups by Ethnic Group
(Figures are percentages)

	Metro-politan	Urban	Rural Non-farm	Rural Farm	Transient
Indian Americans					
Juvenile Females (N = 19)	47.4	10.5	42.1	0.0	0.0
Juvenile Males (N = 43)	39.5	16.3	41.9	2.3	0.0
Male Youth (N = 17)	58.8	5.9	17.6	0.0	17.6
SRM Adult Males (N = 11)	63.6	18.2	18.2	0.0	0.0
SP Adult Males (N = 4)	25.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	25.0
Negroes					
Juvenile Females (N = 13)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Juvenile Males (N = 37)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Male Youth (N = 21)	90.5	4.8	0.0	0.0	4.8
SRM Adult Males (N = 16)	93.8	6.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
SP Adult Males (N = 27)	81.5	3.7	0.0	0.0	14.8
Mexican Americans					
Juvenile Females (N = 3)	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0

TABLE 16 -- Place of Residence for Inmate Groups by Ethnic Group (cont.)

	Metro-politan	Urban	Rural Non-farm	Rural Farm	Transient
Mexican Americans					
Juvenile Males (N = 8)	75.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0
Male Youth (N = 3)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
SRM Adult Males (N = 5)	80.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0
SP Adult Males (N = 1)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Whites					
Juvenile Females (N = 158)	47.5	44.9	5.7	1.9	0.0
Juvenile Males (N = 537)	44.5	37.1	12.8	5.6	0.0
Male Youth* (N = 156)	46.2	30.8	9.6	9.0	3.8
SRM Adult Males (N = 119)	63.9	30.3	5.0	0.0	0.8
SP Adult Males (N = 134)	57.5	14.2	14.2	3.0	11.2

This analysis further confirms the heavily metropolitan and urban concentration of the inmates committed during the period studied. The consistently significant proportions of Indian Americans residing in rural non-farm settings, in metropolitan settings, and as "transients" reinforce the notion of a developing reservation-urban continuum in Minnesota.

Previous Correctional Histories

Were the persons admitted to Minnesota correctional institutions as new court commitments those with previous histories as offenders? Were there similarities or differences between ethnic groups in terms of previous correctional history? Table 17 depicts these relationships for juvenile correctional history, Table 18 for youth correctional history, and Table 19 for adult correctional history.

* No data for 0.6%.

TABLE 17

Previous Juvenile Correctional Histories by Ethnic Group
(Figures are percentages with previous history)

	Minnesota City or County	Minnesota State	Other State
Juvenile Females			
Indian Americans (N = 19)	100.0	0.0	0.0
Negroes (N = 13)	100.0	0.0	0.0
Mexican Americans (N = 3)	66.7	0.0	0.0
Whites (N = 158)	99.4	0.0	0.0
Juvenile Males			
Indian Americans (N = 43)	100.0	0.0	0.0
Negroes (N = 37)	100.0	5.4	0.0
Mexican Americans (N = 8)	100.0	0.0	0.0
Whites (N = 537)	100.0	0.9	0.2
Male Youth			
Indian Americans (N = 17)	64.7	58.8	5.9
Negroes (N = 21)	71.4	57.1	0.0
Mexican Americans (N = 3)	100.0	33.3	0.0
Whites (N = 156)	80.8	47.4	10.9
SRM Adult Males			
Indian Americans (N = 11)	63.6	36.4	18.2
Negroes (N = 16)	50.0	18.8	18.8
Mexican Americans (N = 5)	20.0	20.0	0.0
Whites (N = 119)	52.9	31.9	1.7
SP Adult Males			
Indian Americans (N = 4)	50.0	50.0	0.0
Negroes (N = 27)	14.8	11.1	11.1
Mexican Americans (N = 1)	100.0	100.0	0.0
Whites (N = 134)	20.1	18.7	11.9

Typically, juvenile females -- regardless of ethnicity -- had previous Minnesota city or county juvenile records, but no Minnesota state or other state record. Essentially, the same was true for juvenile males. Male youth in all four ethnic groups revealed a similar pattern of having both a Minnesota city or county correctional history and a Minnesota state record. Only a few whites and Indians had correctional histories from other states. Adult males committed to the State Reformatory were likely to have a Minnesota city or county correctional history, but were less apt to have a Minnesota state history than were the male youth previously described. Although the total number of cases is small, the Indian American SRM adult males were more likely to have all three types of correctional histories than were the other ethnic groups. Adult males in the four ethnic groups committed to the State Prison did not reveal a consistent pattern of juvenile correctional history. Whites and Negroes were not very likely to have any type of juvenile record, while Indians and Mexicans had previous juvenile histories in Minnesota cities or counties or in the state, although the numbers of cases for these two groups are quite small.

TABLE 18

Previous Youth Correctional Histories by Ethnic Group
(Figures are percentages with previous history)

	Minnesota City or County	Minnesota State	Other State
Male Youth			
Indian Americans (N = 17)	11.8	11.8	0.0
Negroes (N = 21)	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mexican Americans (N = 3)	0.0	0.0	0.0
Whites (N = 156)	14.1	5.1	6.4
SRM Adult Males			
Indian Americans (N = 11)	63.6	36.4	18.2
Negroes (N = 16)	43.8	31.3	31.3
Mexican Americans (N = 5)	20.0	0.0	20.0
Whites (N = 119)	55.5	25.2	14.3

TABLE 18 -- Previous Youth Correctional Histories by Ethnic Group (cont.)

	Minnesota City or County	Minnesota State	Other State
SP Adult Males			
Indian Americans (N = 4)	25.0	50.0	0.0
Negroes (N = 27)	11.1	14.8	14.8
Mexican Americans (N = 1)	0.0	100.0	0.0
Whites (N = 134)	10.4	18.7	17.2

Most male youth did not have previous youth correctional histories, regardless of ethnicity, but a minority of Indians and whites had previous Minnesota city or county or Minnesota state correctional histories. A small proportion of whites had previous histories in other states. Adult males committed to the State Reformatory were more likely to have prior records of youth corrections than were the male youth. Mexican Americans were the least likely to have prior youth histories, while Indian Americans were more likely than the other ethnic groups to have previous Minnesota city or county or Minnesota state correctional histories. Minorities of all ethnic groups had previous youth correctional histories in other states. The pattern of previous youth history was not as strong for the adult males committed to the State Prison as for the groups described earlier. Indian Americans, however, were more likely to have a Minnesota city or county youth history, and were among the most likely to have a prior state record, although the total number of Indians was quite small.

TABLE 19

Previous Adult Correctional Histories by Ethnic Group
(Figures are percentages with previous history)

	Minnesota City or County	Minnesota State	Other State
SRM Adult Males			
Indian Americans (N = 11)	18.2	0.0	0.0
Negroes (N = 16)	6.3	0.0	18.8
Mexican Americans (N = 5)	0.0	0.0	20.0
Whites (N = 119)	4.2	0.0	5.0

TABLE 19 -- Previous Adult Correctional Histories by Ethnic Group (cont.)

	Minnesota City or County	Minnesota State	Other State
SP Adult Males			
Indian Americans (N = 4)	75.0	75.0	25.0
Negroes (N = 27)	63.0	22.2	55.6
Mexican Americans (N = 1)	100.0	100.0	0.0
Whites (N = 134)	54.5	44.0	47.8

Only minorities of adult males committed to the State Reformatory had previous adult correctional histories. Slightly less than one-fifth of the Indian Americans had a prior city or county record, and about the same proportion of Negroes had previous correctional histories in other states. Adult males committed to the State Prison were more likely to have prior adult correctional histories in all three categories, but the small number of cases of Indian Americans and Mexican Americans makes comparison difficult.

In sum, it was not uncommon for Minnesota city or county juvenile records to exist for juvenile females and juvenile males, but it was rare for members of these two groups to have Minnesota state or other state juvenile correctional histories. Minnesota city or county juvenile records and Minnesota state juvenile records were relatively common for male youth inmates, but few of these persons had correctional histories in other states. Adult males in the State Reformatory and the State Prison were somewhat less likely to have juvenile correctional histories in Minnesota cities or counties or in the state, but they were slightly more likely to have juvenile records from other states. Indian Americans, regardless of inmate group, were apt to have a Minnesota city or county juvenile correctional history, and Indian male youth and male adults had relatively high proportions with prior Minnesota state juvenile records. Juvenile correctional histories from other states were not at all common. Male youth were generally not likely to have previous youth correctional histories, but about one-tenth of the Indian youth had youth records in Minnesota cities or counties or in the State. Adult males were more likely to have Minnesota city, county or state youth correctional histories and the proportions of Indians with such records were among the highest of all

ethnic groups, although the absolute numbers of Indians were small. Adult correctional histories were rather uncommon for adult males committed to the State Reformatory, but they were rather common for adult males committed to the State Prison.

Marital Status and Living Situation

Were the inmates of these various groups married, single, divorced, widowed? From what sort of living situation did they come? Were their domestic situations indicative of the family disorganization popularly associated with deviancy?

Of the juvenile females only one was married (a Mexican American person), and all the rest were single. Table 20 reveals living situations for juvenile females by ethnic group.

TABLE 20

Juvenile Female Living Situations by Ethnic Group
(Figures are percentages)

Living Situation	Indian Americans (N = 19)	Negroes (N = 13)	Mexican Americans (N = 5)	Whites (N = 158)
Both natural parents	57.9	46.2	66.7	41.1
Mother only	21.1	38.5	0.0	17.7
Father only	5.3	0.0	0.0	5.1
Mother and stepfather	5.3	7.7	0.0	12.0
Father and stepmother	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3
Relatives	0.0	7.7	0.0	3.8
Boarding/foster home	10.5	0.0	0.0	13.3
Group home	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.9
Independent	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3
Treatment institution	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3
Residential institution	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Spouse and in-laws or parents	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0

As expected, virtually all of the juvenile females were single. Both natural parents were encompassed in the living situation in 41.1% to 66.7% of the cases, depending upon ethnic group. One parent, either alone or in some combination with other persons, was present in 0% to 46.2% of the cases. Living situations where neither parent was present (e.g. living with relatives, boarding or foster homes, treatment institutions, etc.) were reported for 0% to

22.8% of the cases. White juvenile females revealed the highest proportion of these cases, followed by Indians, Negroes, and Mexican-Americans, in that order.

All the juvenile males were single. Table 21 describes the living situations of these persons according to their ethnic groupings.

TABLE 21

Juvenile Male Living Situations by Ethnic Group
(Figures are percentages)

Living Situation	Indian Americans (N = 43)	Negroes (N = 37)	Mexican Americans (N = 8)	Whites (N = 537)
Both natural parents	46.5	18.9	25.0	57.7
Mother only	20.9	54.1	37.5	18.4
Father only	2.3	2.7	12.5	3.2
Mother and stepfather	4.7	0.0	12.5	7.8
Father and stepmother	2.3	5.4	0.0	2.2
Adoptive parent	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Boarding/foster home	16.3	10.8	0.0	4.3
Relatives	7.0	2.7	12.5	4.1
Friends	0.0	2.7	0.0	0.0
Independent	0.0	2.7	0.0	0.6
Group home	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4
Treatment institution	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Correctional institution, jail or workhouse	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7

These unmarried juvenile males came from about the same variety of living situations as did the juvenile females. Both actual parents were at home in 18.9% to 57.7% of the cases, depending upon ethnic group. Indian and white juvenile males were more likely to come from homes having both natural parents than were Mexican and Negro juveniles. The latter two groups were more likely to come from homes having only the mother present than were whites and Indians. Living situations including neither of the two natural parents occurred for 6.7%of the whites, 12.5% of the Mexican Americans, 18.9% of the Negroes, and 23.3% of the Indians.

The male youth -- those between the ages of eighteen and twenty-one -- displayed more variety in marital status. Table 22 describes the proportions of each ethnic group which fell within various marital status categories.

TABLE 22

Marital Status of Male Youth by Ethnic Group
(Figures are percentages)

Marital Status	Indian Americans (N = 17)	Negroes (N = 21)	Mexican Americans (N = 3)	Whites (N = 156)
Single	82.4	85.7	66.7	89.1
Married	11.8	14.3	0.0	8.3
Non-legal separation	0.0	0.0	33.3	1.3
Divorced	5.9	0.0	0.0	1.3

Although the absolute numbers are small, relatively high proportions of Indian Americans and Negroes were married as compared with Mexican Americans and whites. The prevailing marital status, however, remained that of being single.

What were the living arrangements of these male youth? Table 23 reports these living situations by ethnic group.

TABLE 23

Male Youth Living Situations by Ethnic Group
(Figures are percentages)

Living Situation	Indian Americans (N = 17)	Negroes (N = 21)	Mexican Americans (N = 5)	Whites (N = 156)
Both natural parents	23.5	9.5	33.3	37.9
Mother only	23.5	14.3	0.0	17.9
Father only	5.9	9.5	0.0	3.2
Mother and stepfather	11.8	28.6	0.0	9.0
Father and stepmother	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3
Spouse only	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Spouse and children	5.9	9.5	0.0	5.8
Spouse and in-laws	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.6
Relatives	5.9	14.3	33.3	3.2
Boarding/foster home	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Friends	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.8
Independent	17.6	14.3	0.0	14.7
Correctional institution, jail or workhouse	0.0	0.0	33.3	1.3

With the exception of the Mexican-American inmates (of whom there were only three), about the same proportion (60% or better) of the different groups of the male youth came from living situations including at least one parent.

Negroes were more likely than either Indian Americans or whites to be living with relatives, but all groups (again excluding Mexican-Americans) revealed a substantial minority who were independent.

The marital status of adult males committed to the State Reformatory is shown in Table 24.

TABLE 24

Marital Status of SRM Adult Males by Ethnic Group
(Figures are percentages)

Marital Status	Indian Americans (N = 11)	Negroes (N = 16)	Mexican Americans (N = 5)	Whites (N = 119)
Single	72.7	62.5	80.0	59.7
Married	27.3	25.0	0.0	27.7
Non-legal separation	0.0	0.0	20.0	3.4
Divorced	0.0	6.3	0.0	8.4
Non-legal association	0.0	6.3	0.0	0.0
Legal separation	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8

The majority of the adult males in each ethnic group were single. Except for the Mexican-Americans, about one-fourth of each group were married. Table 25 describes the living situations of these men.

TABLE 25

SRM Adult Male Living Situations by Ethnic Group
(Figures are percentages)

Living Situation	Indian Americans (N = 11)	Negroes (N = 16)	Mexican Americans (N = 5)	Whites (N = 119)
Both natural parents	9.1	12.5	20.0	23.6
Mother only	18.2	6.2	0.0	13.4
Father only	0.0	6.2	0.0	0.0
Mother and stepfather	0.0	6.2	0.0	5.0
Father and stepmother	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
Adoptive parents	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
Spouse only	9.1	0.0	0.0	7.6
Spouse and children	18.2	18.8	0.0	16.9
Spouse and in-laws	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.5
Relatives	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Friends	0.0	12.5	20.0	6.7

TABLE 25 -- SRM Adult Male Living Situations by Ethnic Group (cont.)

Living Situation	Indian Americans	Negroes	Mexican Americans	Whites
Independent	36.4	31.3	40.0	21.0
Boarding/foster home	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
Correctional institution	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
Other	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0
Unknown	0.0	6.2	0.0	0.0

White SRM adult males were more likely than any of the other groups to be living with at least one natural parent. Similarly, minority group members were more likely to be living independently than were whites. Relatively large proportions of Indian American inmates, compared with the other groups, were living with spouses, spouses and children, and with relatives.

The marital status of adult males committed to the State Prison is recorded in Table 26.

TABLE 26

Marital Status of SP Adult Males by Ethnic Group
(Figures are percentages)

Marital Status	Indian Americans (N = 4)	Negroes (N = 27)	Mexican Americans (N = 1)	Whites (N = 134)
Single	25.0	22.2	0.0	24.6
Married	50.0	25.9	100.0	30.6
Non-legal separation	0.0	11.1	0.0	10.4
Divorced	0.0	22.2	0.0	27.6
Widowed	0.0	3.7	0.0	6.7
Non-legal association	25.0	14.8	0.0	0.0

The small absolute numbers of Indian Americans and Mexican Americans make comparisons difficult but, for all groups, the single and married categories account for a majority, or very near a majority, of the inmates. With the Negro and white groups -- where the numbers are larger -- a greater variety of marital statuses is apparent than was the case with earlier inmate groups. The living situations accompanying these marital arrangements are revealed in Table 27.

TABLE 27

SP Adult Male Living Situations by Ethnic Group
(Figures are percentages)

Living Situation	Indian Americans (N = 4)	Negroes (N = 27)	Mexican Americans (N = 1)	Whites (N = 134)
Both natural parents	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.0
Mother only	0.0	3.7	0.0	3.0
Father only	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Mother and stepfather	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Spouse only	0.0	7.4	0.0	8.2
Spouse and children	50.0	22.2	0.0	19.4
Relatives	0.0	3.7	0.0	1.5
Friends	0.0	3.7	0.0	3.0
Independent	0.0	18.5	0.0	15.7
Treatment institution	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5
Unknown	50.0	40.7	100.0	39.6

Large proportions of the State Prison adult males had "unknown" living situations. For those whose living situations were known, the most common statuses were with spouse only, with spouse and children, and independent.

In sum, Indian American juveniles, when compared with juveniles from other groups, did not appear to be more likely to come from "broken homes". Because of the strong kin-orientation of tribal people, one might expect Indian juveniles to show a comparative tendency to live with relatives, but this was not so for the Indians in this study. Indeed, these Indian juveniles were relatively more likely to come from special boarding and foster home arrangements. Comparatively speaking, the Indian male youth were apt to come from home situations including both natural parents or the mother only, they were not particularly likely to be living with relatives, and they were somewhat inclined to be living independently. Indian adult males committed to the State Reformatory were very similar to the other inmate groups in terms of their living situations, although they showed a slight contrasting tendency to live with relatives. The small number of cases of Indian adult males committed to the State Prison makes comparison of living situations hazardous.

Religion

Were there differences in religious affiliation between the various ethnic groups? Table 28 indicates the religions named by juvenile females.

TABLE 28

Juvenile Female Religious Affiliation by Ethnic Group
(Figures are percentages)

Religion	Indian Americans (N = 19)	Negroes (N = 13)	Mexican Americans (N = 5)	Whites (N = 158)
Catholic	68.4	38.5	100.0	38.0
Lutheran	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.3
Methodist	5.3	0.0	0.0	4.4
Episcopalian	15.8	0.0	0.0	0.6
Presbyterian	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3
Baptist	0.0	30.8	0.0	3.8
Other Protestant	10.5	30.8	0.0	25.3
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
None professed	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6

Indian Americans and Mexican Americans revealed the largest proportions of Catholics. Episcopal and "other Protestant" faiths accounted for significant minorities of Indians, while Baptists and "other Protestants" were prominent among Negroes. By contrast with the other groups, one-fourth of the whites were Lutherans.

Table 29 shows the religious affiliations of the juvenile males.

TABLE 29

Juvenile Male Religious Affiliation by Ethnic Group
(Figures are percentages)

Religion	Indian Americans (N = 43)	Negroes (N = 37)	Mexican Americans (N = 8)	Whites (N = 537)
Catholic	60.5	21.6	87.5	36.3
Jewish	0.0	2.7	0.0	0.4
Lutheran	9.3	0.0	0.0	27.6
Methodist	0.0	2.7	0.0	2.6
Episcopalian	11.6	0.0	0.0	1.1
Presbyterian	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.7
Baptist	2.3	37.8	0.0	2.6
Other Protestant	9.3	35.1	0.0	26.8
Other	4.7	0.0	0.0	1.3
None professed	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.6

The pattern of religious affiliations revealed here is essentially the same as that in Table 28.

Table 30 describes the distribution of religious affiliation for male youth.

TABLE 30

Male Youth Religious Affiliation by Ethnic Group
(Figures are percentages)

Religion	Indian Americans (N = 17)	Negroes (N = 21)	Mexican Americans (N = 3)	Whites (N = 156)
Catholic	58.8	4.8	100.0	39.1
Jewish	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3
Lutheran	5.9	4.8	0.0	39.1
Methodist	0.0	9.5	0.0	4.5
Episcopalian	23.5	0.0	0.0	1.3
Presbyterian	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2
Baptist	0.0	42.9	0.0	5.1
Other Protestant	11.8	33.3	0.0	6.4
None professed	0.0	4.8	0.0	0.0

The pattern of religious affiliation shown here seems to differ from the patterns of the two juvenile groups only in that a smaller proportion of Negroes were Catholic, and a smaller proportion of whites were "Other Protestants".

The religious affiliations of adult males committed to the State Reformatory are revealed in Table 31.

TABLE 31

SRM Adult Male Religious Affiliation by Ethnic Group
(Figures are percentages)

Religion	Indian Americans (N = 11)	Negroes (N = 16)	Mexican Americans (N = 5)	Whites (N = 119)
Catholic	45.5	18.8	60.0	31.1
Lutheran	18.2	6.2	0.0	31.9
Methodist	0.0	12.5	0.0	5.0
Episcopalian	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Presbyterian	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7
Baptist	0.0	31.1	20.0	6.7
Other Protestant	27.3	25.0	20.0	21.0
None professed	0.0	6.2	0.0	2.5

For Indians the pattern of religious affiliation was like those for Indian inmate groups described earlier, with the exception of a greater

representation of Lutherans, and a somewhat smaller proportion of Episcopalians. Negroes showed the familiar pattern of religious affiliation except for a somewhat larger proportion of Methodists; whites were similar to white groups in their religious affiliations. It is difficult to conclude anything from the Mexican-American group because of the small number of persons involved.

Religious affiliation of the adult males committed to the State Prison is outlined in Table 32.

TABLE 32

SP Adult Male Religious Affiliation by Ethnic Group
(Figures are percentages)

Religion	Indian Americans (N = 4)	Negroes (N = 27)	Mexican Americans (N = 1)	Whites (N = 134)
Catholic	75.0	25.9	100.0	32.8
Lutheran	0.0	0.0	0.0	37.3
Methodist	0.0	3.7	0.0	3.0
Episcopalian	25.0	3.7	0.0	1.5
Presbyterian	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.7
Baptist	0.0	37.0	0.0	3.7
Other Protestant	0.0	3.7	0.0	3.7
Other religion	0.0	11.1	0.0	1.5
None professed	0.0	14.8	0.0	12.7

Small numbers of Indians and Mexicans make comparisons difficult. The pattern of religious affiliations revealed by Negro adult males admitted to the State Prison differs from early Negro inmate groups in the lower proportions of "Other protestants" and in the higher proportions in the "None professed" and "Other religion" categories.

Considering all inmate groups, the "typical" religious preference patterns seem to be the following: for Indians -- Catholic, Episcopalian, and Other Protestant; for Negroes -- Catholic, Baptist, and Other Protestant; for Mexicans -- Catholic; and for whites -- Catholic, Lutheran, and Other Protestant.

Intelligence Estimate

Corrections personnel classify the intelligence of inmates from available test records according to a special table. What were the differences in estimated intelligence between the several inmate groups and between the various ethnic groups?

Table 33 compares the estimated intelligence of juvenile female inmates according to ethnic group.

TABLE 33

Juvenile Female Estimated Intelligence by Ethnic Group
(Figures are percentages)

Estimated Intelligence	Indian Americans (N = 19)	Negroes (N = 13)	Mexican Americans (N = 3)	Whites (N = 158)
Superior	5.3	0.0	0.0	7.6
Bright normal	5.3	7.7	0.0	25.3
Average	42.1	30.8	33.3	39.2
Dull normal	42.1	30.8	66.7	21.5
Borderline	5.3	23.1	0.0	4.4
Defective	0.0	7.7	0.0	1.9

All three minority groups, when compared with the whites, tended to be classified as average or below average in intelligence, although this may be a result of the small numbers of inmates in each group. By contrast, fully one-fourth of the whites were classified as bright normal.

The distribution of intelligence estimates for juvenile males is shown in Table 34.

TABLE 34

Juvenile Male Estimated Intelligence by Ethnic Group
(Figures are percentages)

Estimated Intelligence	Indian Americans (N = 43)	Negroes (N = 37)	Mexican Americans (N = 8)	Whites (N = 537)
Superior	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.7
Bright normal	4.7	5.4	0.0	17.1
Average	51.2	37.8	75.0	49.3
Dull normal	39.5	35.1	12.5	20.3
Borderline	4.7	10.8	12.5	4.7
Defective	0.0	10.8	0.0	1.7
Unknown	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2

Once again, the tendency was for minority group members to be classified as average or below average in intelligence, while greater variablility in intelligence classification for whites was the case, with a smaller proportion of whites classified below average than was the case with Negroes and Indian Americans.

Table 35 reveals the estimated intelligence for male youth according to ethnic group.

TABLE 35

Male Youth Estimated Intelligence by Ethnic Group
(Figures are percentages)

Estimated Intelligence	Indian Americans (N = 17)	Negroes (N = 21)	Mexican Americans (N = 3)	Whites (N = 156)
Superior	5.9	0.0	0.0	7.1
Bright normal	11.8	9.5	33.3	21.8
Average	52.9	47.6	66.7	46.8
Dull normal	17.6	28.6	0.0	17.3
Borderline	5.9	14.3	0.0	7.1
Unknown	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0

While white male youths tended to be classified as average or above average, Indian Americans and Negroes most often fell into the average and below average categories. There were too few Mexican Americans for a meaningful pattern to emerge.

Table 36 describes the estimated intelligence of male adult inmates committed to the State Reformatory.

TABLE 36

SRM Adult Male Estimated Intelligence by Ethnic Group
(Figures are percentages)

Estimated Intelligence	Indian Americans (N = 11)	Negroes (N = 16)	Mexican Americans (N = 5)	Whites (N = 119)
Superior	0.0	18.8	0.0	8.4
Bright normal	9.1	12.5	0.0	8.4
Average	45.5	31.3	60.0	50.4
Dull normal	27.3	31.3	40.0	28.6
Borderline	18.2	0.0	0.0	1.7
Defective	0.0	6.2	0.0	0.8
Unknown	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7

The patterns of intelligence estimates for adult males are somewhat different. While Indian Americans and Mexican Americans tended to be classified as average or below average in intelligence (as was the case with the previous groups), a larger proportion of the Negroes were classified above average than previously, and a larger proportion of whites were classified below average than was the case with younger inmate groups.

Finally, Table 37 shows the estimated intelligence for adult males committed to the State Prison.

TABLE 37

SP Adult Male Estimated Intelligence by Ethnic Group

(Figures are percentages)

Estimated Intelligence	Indian Americans (N=4)	Negroes (N=27)	Mexican Americans (N=17)	Whites (N=134)
Superior	0.0	3.7	0.0	9.7
Bright Normal	0.0	7.4	0.0	24.6
Average	100.0	29.7	100.0	50.0
Dull Normal	0.0	22.2	0.0	8.2
Borderline	0.0	14.8	0.0	1.5
Defective	0.0	14.8	0.0	3.0
Untestable	0.0	3.7	0.0	0.0
Unknown	0.0	3.7	0.0	3.0

Considering the small number of Negroes, considerable variability in intelligence occurred within that group. However, the usual patterns emerged for all groups, with minority groups tending to be classified as average or below average and whites tending to be classified as average or above average.

Educational Attainment

For each of the inmate groups, and for each ethnic group, what was the highest academic school grade completed?

Table 38 lists the educational attainment of the juvenile females.

TABLE 38

Educational Attainment of Juvenile Females by Ethnic Group

(Figures are percentages)

Highest Academic School Grade Completed	Indian Americans (N=19)	Negroes (N=13)	Mexican Americans (N=3)	Whites (N=158)
No data	0.0	15.4	33.3	2.5
5	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
6	10.5	15.4	0.0	2.5

Table 38-Educational Attainment of Juvenile Females by Ethnic Group-continued

Highest Academic School Grade Completed	Indian Americans	Negroes	Mexican Americans	Whites
7	10.5	7.7	0.0	15.2
8	15.8	15.4	0.0	22.8
9	26.3	15.4	33.3	32.3
10	26.3	30.8	33.3	19.0
11	5.3	0.0	0.0	5.7

A majority - or very near a majority - of each of the four groups of juvenile females had completed the 9th, 10th or 11th grades. The distribution of ages for these juvenile females is not available, but, of course, the Corrections Department category "juvenile" includes only those under 18. About 15% of the Indian American and about 15% of the Negro groups had completed the 5th or 6th grade, contrasted with 2.5% of the whites.

Described in Table 39 is the educational attainment of juvenile males by ethnic group.

TABLE 39

Educational Attainment of Juvenile Males by Ethnic Group

(Figures are percentages)

Highest Academic School Grade Completed	Indian Americans (N=43)	Negroes (N=37)	Mexican Americans (N=8)	Whites (N=537)
No data	0.0	5.4	12.5	1.1
4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4
5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
6	4.7	2.7	0.0	4.1
7	30.2	10.8	0.0	10.6
8	32.6	21.6	37.5	27.9
9	23.3	35.1	37.5	31.1
10	9.3	16.2	0.0	17.7
11	0.0	2.7	12.5	6.1
12	0.0	5.4	0.0	0.4

Once again, it would be useful to have age data to compare with educational attainment. It is apparent from Table 39 that the majority of inmates in each ethnic group had achieved the 7th, 8th or 9th grade level.

Table 40 lists the highest school grade completed by the male youth.

TABLE 40

Educational Attainment of Male Youth by Ethnic Group
(Figures are percentages)

Highest Academic School Grade Completed	Indian American (N=17)	Negroes (N=21)	Mexican Americans (N=3)	Whites (N=156)
No data	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3
6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
7	11.8	0.0	0.0	2.6
8	23.5	9.5	0.0	14.7
9	23.5	28.6	66.7	26.3
10	23.5	23.8	0.0	20.5
11	11.8	4.8	33.3	14.1
12	5.9	28.6	0.0	19.9
13	0.0	4.8	0.0	0.0

As stated earlier, male youth are individuals between the ages of 18 and 21 who are convicted of felonies or gross misdemeanors by District Courts, and who are committed to the Youth Conservation Commission. No specific age breakdown is available. One-fifth and one-third of the Negroes and Whites, respectively, had completed twelve years of schooling, but few Indians and no Mexican Americans had done so. A majority of each group had completed the 9th, 10th, or 11th grade.

Table 41 reveals the highest academic school grade completed by the adult males committed to the State Reformatory.

TABLE 41

Educational Attainment of SRM Adult Males by Ethnic Group
(Figures are percentages)

Highest Academic School Grade Completed	Indian Americans (N=11)	Negroes (N=16)	Mexican Americans (N=5)	Whites (N=119)
No data	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
7	0.0	0.0	20.0	1.7
8	36.4	0.0	20.0	11,7
9	27.3	25.0	0.0	18.4
10	18.2	12.5	0.0	21.5
11	0.0	25.0	20.0	11.7
12	18.2	37.5	40.0	31.0
13	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7
14	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
15	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8

Between approximately 20% and about 40% of the adult male inmates (all over 21) were high school graduates. A majority or very near a majority of the Indian, Negro and White inmates had completed the 9th, 10th or 11th grade. No more specific age delineation is available.

Table 42 describes the educational attainment of SP adult males by ethnic group.

TABLE 42
Educational Attainment of SP Adult Males by Ethnic Group
(Figures are percentages)

Highest Academic School Grade Completed	Indian Americans (N=4)	Negroes (N=27)	Mexican Americans (N=1)	Whites (N=134)
No data	0.0	7.4	0.0	0.8
3	0.0	3.7	0.0	0.0
4	0.0	3.7	0.0	2.2
5	0.0	7.4	0.0	2.2
6	0.0	7.4	0.0	3.7
7	25.0	3.7	0.0	5.2
8	25.0	3.7	0.0	19.4
9	25.0	7.4	100.0	13.4
10	25.0	11.1	0.0	13.4
11	0.0	18.5	0.0	8.2
12	0.0	18.5	0.0	25.4
13	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
14	0.0	7.4	0.0	3.0
15	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
16	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
17	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2

The exact age distribution of these State Prison adult males - all more than 21 - is not readily available, and the small numbers of Indian Americans and Mexican Americans makes meaningful observation difficult. However, a wide range of educational achievement is apparent for both the Negro and the white groups, a slightly higher proportion of whites than Negroes had 12 or more years of education, and about twice the proportion of Negroes had achieved 7th grade level or below when compared with whites. The white group showed the greatest variability in educational attainment.

Occupational Skill Level

Employment experiences of the inmates are classified according to the amount of skill exhibited. What occupational skill level patterns existed among the inmates in this study?

Table 43 indicates the occupational skill level of the juvenile females.

TABLE 43
Occupational Skill Level of Juvenile Females by Ethnic Group
(Figures are percentages)

Occupational Skill Level	Indian Americans (N=19)	Negroes (N=13)	Mexican Americans (N=3)	Whites (N=158)
No data	5.3	7.7	0.0	4.4
Skilled	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Semi-skilled	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Unskilled	89.5	92.3	100.0	95.6

As might be expected because of their youth, the vast majority of juvenile females were classified as unskilled.

Table 44 presents the same information for juvenile males.

TABLE 44
Occupational Skill Level of Juvenile Males by Ethnic Group
(Figures are percentages)

Occupational Skill Level	Indian Americans (N=43)	Negroes (N=37)	Mexican Americans (N=8)	Whites (N=537)
No data	0.0	2.7	0.0	3.4
Skilled	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Semi-skilled	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Unskilled	100.0	97.3	100.0	96.5

Essentially the same pattern of skills appears here as was the case with the juvenile females.

Table 45 reveals the occupational skill levels of male youth from various ethnic groups.

TABLE 45
Occupational Skill Level of Male Youth by Ethnic Group
(Figures are percentages)

Occupational Skill Level	Indian Americans (N=17)	Negroes (N=21)	Mexican Americans (N=3)	Whites (N=156)
No data	0.0	0.0	33.3	1.9
Skilled	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Semi-skilled	0.0	4.8	0.0	13.5
Unskilled	100.0	95.2	66.7	84.6

Once again, the predominant skill pattern is "unskilled," but there appears to be a developing tendency in this older group for "semi-skilled" occupations to be reported.

The skill levels of adult males committed to the State Reformatory appear in Table 46.

TABLE 46
Occupational Skill Levels of SRM Adult Males by Ethnic Group
(Figures are percentages)

Occupational Skill Level	Indian Americans (N=11)	Negroes (N=16)	Mexican Americans (N=5)	Whites (N=119)
No data	0.0	12.5	0.0	1.7
Skilled	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Semi-skilled	0.0	0.0	20.0	3.4
Unskilled	100.0	87.5	80.0	95.0

Despite the fact that these adult males are older than the preceeding groups, the predominant occupational skill is still "semi-skilled."

In Table 47 are presented comparable data for adult males committed to the State Prison.

TABLE 47
Occupational Skill Levels of SP Adult Males by Ethnic Group
(Figures are percentages)

Occupational Skill Level	Indian Americans (N=4)	Negroes (N=27)	Mexican Americans (N=1)	Whites (N=134)
No data	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5
Skilled	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.5
Semi-skilled	0.0	14.8	100.0	38.8
Unskilled	100.0	85.2	0.0	55.2

This group of adult males reveals a somewhat stronger tendency toward semi-skilled work, but the predominant skill level remains "unskilled."

Current Employment Status

Further insight into the work lives of these inmates can be gained by examining their employment status at the time of conviction. First, the juvenile females.

Table 48 indicates their employment status.

TABLE 48
Employment Status of Juvenile Females by Ethnic Group
(Figures are percentages)

Employment Status	Indian Americans (N=19)	Negroes (N=13)	Mexican Americans (N=3)	Whites (N=158)
No data	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Employed full time	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.8
Employed part time	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Irregular (odd jobs)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Not employed-not in school	0.0	7.7	33.3	5.1
Housewife only	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Not employed-in school	100.0	92.3	66.7	90.5
Employed-in school	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Among the juvenile females, the usual situation was to be unemployed and in school. A few Negroes, whites and Mexican Americans were unemployed and not in school.

Table 49 lists the employment status of juvenile males.

TABLE 49
Employment Status of Juvenile Males by Ethnic Group
(Figures are percentages)

Employment Status	Indian Americans (N=43)	Negroes (N=37)	Mexican Americans (N=8)	Whites (N=537)
No data	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Employed full-time	0.0	5.4	0.0	1.7
Employed part-time	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Irregular (odd jobs)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Not empl.-not in school	9.3	8.1	12.5	7.6
Not employed-in school	90.7	86.5	87.5	89.8
Employed-in school	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

The employment patterns of juvenile males were essentially the same as those of juvenile females, although the slight tendency to be unemployed and not in school was somewhat stronger and, among whites in particular, there were very slight proportions of inmates in other employment categories.
Table 50 shows the employment status of male youth.

TABLE 50
Employment Status of Male Youth by Ethnic Group
(Figures are percentages)

Employment Status	Indian Americans (N=17)	Negroes (N=21)	Mexican Americans (N=3)	Whites (N=156)
No data	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Employed full-time	47.1	33.3	0.0	57.1
Employed part-time	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2
Irregular (odd jobs)	5.9	0.0	0.0	6.4
Not empl.-not in school	41.2	61.9	66.7	30.1
Not employed-in school	5.9	4.8	0.0	2.6
Employed-in school	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6

The male youth - individuals between 18 and 21 years of age - revealed a considerably different employment pattern. Very small proportions were still in school, while generally large proportions were not employed and not in school and employed full time. Part-time employment accounted for few individuals, as did irregular, or odd-job employment.

Table 51 shows the employment status of SRM adult males by ethnic group.

TABLE 51
Employment Status of SRM Adult Males by Ethnic Group
(Figures are percentages)

Employment Status	Indian Americans (N=11)	Negroes (N=16)	Mexican Americans (N=5)	Whites (N=119)
No data	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Employed full time	18.2	18.8	0.0	26.1
Employed part time	9.1	12.5	40.0	10.1
Irregular (odd jobs)	9.1	12.5	20.0	7.6
Not empl.-not in school	63.6	56.3	40.0	54.6
Not employed-in school	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7
Employed-in school	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

For these adult males, the usual employment situation was to be unemployed and not in school. Smaller proportions were employed full-time than was the case with the male youth, and more consistent proportions were employed part-time and on irregular jobs.

Table 52 describes the employment status of SP adult males by ethnic group.

TABLE 52
Employment Status of SP Adult Males by Ethnic Group
(Figures are percentages)

Employment Status	Indian Americans (N=4)	Negroes (N=27)	Mexican Americans (N=1)	Whites (N=134)
No data	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Employed full time	0.0	18.5	0.0	23.9
Employed part time	0.0	3.7	0.0	3.0
Irregular (odd jobs)	50.0	14.8	0.0	9.7
Not empl.-not in school	50.0	63.0	100.0	63.4
Not employed-in school	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Employed-in school	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

SP adult males revealed a pattern of employment similar to that shown by SRM adult males, except that there was a somewhat greater tendency to be unemployed and not in school.

Previous Psychiatric Treatment and Pre-Sentence Psychiatric Evaluation

Among these inmates, what was the incidence of previous psychiatric treatment and pre-sentence psychiatric evaluation?

TABLE 53
Previous Psychiatric Treatment of Inmates
by Inmate Classification and Ethnic Group
(Figures are percentages)

	Psychiatric Treatment				
Inmate Group	Hospitalization	Out-patient	Hospital and Outpatient	None	Unknown
Juvenile Females					
Indian Americans (N=19)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Negroes (N=13)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Mexican Americans (N=3)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Whites (N=158)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Juvenile Males					
Indian Americans (N=43)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Negroes (N=37)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Mexican Americans (N=8)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Whites (N=537)	0.5	0.0	0.5	0.0	99.0
Male Youth					
Indian Americans (N=17)	17.6	0.0	0.0	41.2	41.2
Negroes (N=21)	0.0	0.0	4.8	19.0	76.2
Mexican Americans (N=3)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Whites (N=156)	7.7	5.8	1.3	32.1	53.2
SRM Adult Males					
Indian Americans (N=11)	0.0	0.0	9.1	81.8	9.1
Negroes (N=16)	12.5	0.0	0.0	81.3	6.3
Mexican Americans (N=5)	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Whites (N=119)	12.6	0.8	2.5	83.2	0.8
SP Adult Males					
Indian Americans (N=4)	25.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	50.0
Negroes (N=27)	14.8	0.0	3.7	18.5	63.0
Mexican Americans (N= 1)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Whites (N=134)	32.8	0.0	2.2	24.6	40.3

For juveniles, the incidence of psychiatric treatment before committment was unknown in practically every case. It might be useful to see if data collection procedures could be improved somehow so that an accurate assessment of treatment provided could be made. It is often agreed that therapy is more effective when given at younger ages, and it is not clear whether any appreciable amount of therapy is provided for these juveniles. In the case of youth some psychiatric treatment was provided to small proportions of Indian Americans, Negroes and whites, and the same was true for adult males committed to the State Reformatory. The pattern of previous psychiatric treatment for adult males committed to the State Prison was essentially the same, except that an unusually

large proportion (32.8%) of whites had been hospitalized for psychiatric treatment.

Several matters are suggested for further consideration. First, it would be helpful to know to what extent psychiatric aid is available to potential inmates in the early stages of conflict with the law. To serve a preventive purpose, such assistance needs to be readily available to be employed by those who would counsel young people and their families. Second, the appropriateness and effectiveness of various forms of psychotherapy for persons from minority cultures and lower socio-economic classes needs to be explored. This is particularly true for Indian Americans. Finally, for those who have received psychotherapy deemed appropriate to their needs, committment to one of Minnesota's correctional institutions may be taken as fairly strong evidence of the failure of therapy. In recent years several critics have openly challenged the meaning of "mental illness" and the effectiveness of traditional forms of therapy. Perhaps what is needed is more complete information about the diagnosis of therapeutic needs, the treatment undertaken and the subsequent functioning of persons with whom professionals in the corrections system come into contact.

Table 54 describes the known incidence of pre-sentence psychiatric evaluation.

TABLE 54

Pre-Sentence Psychiatric Evaluation of Inmates by Inmate Classification and Ethnic Group

(Figures are percentages)

Inmate Group	Pre-Sentence Psychiatric Evaluation Yes	No	Unknown
Juvenile Females			
Indian Americans (N=19)	0.0	0.0	100.0
Negroes (N=13)	0.0	0.0	100.0
Mexican Americans (N=3)	0.0	0.0	100.0
Whites (N=158)	0.0	0.0	100.0
Juvenile Males			
Indian Americans (N=43)	0.0	100.0	0.0
Negroes (N=37)	0.0	0.0	100.0
Mexican Americans (N=8)	0.0	0.0	100.0
Whites (N=537)	0.0	0.0	100.0
Male Youth			
Indian Americans (N=17)	5.9	64.7	29.4
Negroes (N=21)	19.0	28.6	52.4
Mexican Americans (N=3)	33.3	0.0	66.7
Whites (N=156)	12.8	61.5	25.6
SRM Adult Males			
Indian Americans (N=11)	0.0	81.8	18.2
Negroes (N=16)	18.8	75.0	6.3
Mexican Americans (N=5)	0.0	100.0	0.0
Whites (N=119)	6.7	89.1	4.2
SP Adult Males			
Indian Americans (N=4)	0.0	25.0	75.0
Negroes (N=27)	18.5	25.9	55.6
Mexican Americans (N=1)	0.0	0.0	100.0
Whites (N=134)	16.4	33.6	50.0

The large proportion of inmates for whom it is unknown whether or not a presentence psychiatric evaluation was made suggests the need for an improved information system and makes it difficult to draw conclusions. These data do not show the results of those evaluations which were made, and one wonders if they might have called for social reinforcement and experiences not obtainable in the conventional correctional setting.

Physical, Drug and Alcohol Problems

The physical problems of inmates are assessed and classified. Table 55 reports these physical problems by inmate classification and ethnic group.

TABLE 55
Physical Problems of Inmates by Inmate Classification and Ethnic Group
(Figures are percentages)

	PHYSICAL PROBLEMS				
Inmate Group	No data	Remedial	Chronic	Remedial & Chronic	None
Juvenile Females					
Indian Americans (N=19)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Negroes (N=13)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Mexican Americans (N=3)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Whites (N=158)	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	98.7
Juvenile Males					
Indian Americans (N=43)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Negroes (N=37)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Mexican Americans (N=8)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Whites (N=537)	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.2	99.4
Male Youth					
Indian Americans (N=17)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Negroes (N=21)	4.8	0.0	9.5	0.0	85.7
Mexican Americans (N=3)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Whites (N=156)	1.3	0.0	7.1	0.0	91.7
SRM Adult Males					
Indian Americans (N=11)	0.0	0.0	9.1	0.0	90.9
Negroes (N=16)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Mexican Americans (N=5)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Whites (N=119)	0.0	0.0	1.7	0.8	97.5
SP Adult Males					
Indian Americans (N=4)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Negroes (N=27)	0.0	7.4	14.8	0.0	77.8
Mexican Americans (N=1)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Whites (N=138)	0.0	5.2	13.4	0.0	81.4

These data indicate that most inmates have no physical problems. Those problems which do exist tend to be of the "chronic variety."

Finally, Table 56 delineates the drug and alcohol problems experienced by these

inmates.

TABLE 56
Drug and Alcohol Problems of Inmates by Inmate Classification and Ethnic Group
(Figures are percentages)

Inmate Group	Drug Only	Alcohol Only	Both drugs and Alcohol	None	Unknown
Juvenile Females					
Indian Americans (N=19)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Negroes (N=13)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Mexican Americans (N=3)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Whites (N=158)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Juvenile Males					
Indian Americans (N-43)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Negroes (N=37)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Mexican Americans (N=8)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Whites (N=537)	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.0	99.4
Male Youth					
Indian Americans (N=17)	11.8	11.8	0.0	70.6	5.9
Negroes (N=21)	4.8	4.8	0.0	85.7	4.8
Mexican Americans (N=3)	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Whites (N=156)	9.6	4.5	0.6	82.1	3.2
SRM Adult Males					
Indian Americans (N=11)	0.0	27.3	0.0	72.7	0.0
Negroes (N=16)	6.3	0.0	0.0	87.5	6.3
Mexican Americans (N=5)	0.0	20.0	0.0	80.0	0.0
Whites (N=119)	7.6	9.2	0.0	82.4	0.8
SP Adult Males					
Indian Americans (N=4)	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0
Negroes (N=27)	18.5	14.8	0.0	0.0	66.7
Mexican Americans (N=1)	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Whites (N=134)	3.7	39.6	1.5	6.7	48.5

For virtually all the juveniles, the presence or absence of drug or alcohol problems was unknown, but in the case of male youth both drug and alcohol problems emerged for 5% to 10% of most groups, while the large majority had no drug or alcohol problems. Considering both adult groups, Indian Americans most often reflected alcohol problems, Negroes and whites had both drug and alcohol problems, and a large proportion of whites committed to the State Prison had problems with alcohol.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Woods, Richard G. and Arthur M. Harkins. Rural and City Indians in Minnesota Prisons. Minneapolis: Training Center for Community Programs, University of Minnesota. January, 1970.

[2]Juvenile new court commitments for purposes of this study were recorded at the point of entry into the Minnesota Reception and Diagnostic Center at Lino Lakes. Assignment of juvenile inmates to permanent institutions is made from the Center. Because the juvenile new court commitments were recorded at the Center, data for each of the institutions to which subsequent assignment is made are not reported specifically for the State Training School for Boys at Red Wing, the Minnesota Home School at Sauk Centre, the Youth Vocational Training Center Camp No. 4 at Rochester, the St. Croix Forestry Camp No. 3 at Sandstone, and the Thistledew Forestry Camp No. 2 at Togo. Male youth new court commitments were similarly recorded at the Minnesota Reception and Diagnostic Center; therefore, no data are reported for male youth admitted to the State Reformatory for Men at St. Cloud and the Willow River Forestry Camp No. 1 at Willow River. There were an insufficient number of female youth new court commitments to warrant reporting admissions to the Reception and Diagnostic Center at the Minnesota Correctional Institution for Women at Shakopee.